

Serial No. 10/664,080 10  
Docket No. C14-16132M/TRK  
(NGB.297)

### **REMARKS**

Applicant concurrently files herewith a Request for Continued Examination (RCE), an Excess Claim Fee Payment Letter, and corresponding RCE and excess claim fees.

Claims 1-25 are all of the claims presently pending in the application. Applicant has amended the claims to define the claimed invention more particularly. Applicant has added claim 25 to claim additional features of the invention.

It is noted that the claim amendments are made only for more particularly pointing out the invention, and not for distinguishing the invention over the prior art, narrowing the claims or for any statutory requirements of patentability. Further, Applicants specifically state that no amendment to any claim herein should be construed as a disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of the amended claim.

In the final Office Action dated December 24, 2008, claims 1 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palalau et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,373,472; hereinafter “Palalau”) in view of Stephan (U.S. Patent No. 5,748,185), and further in view of Rowe (U.S. Patent No. 6,559,833), claims 1-3, 6-7 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephan in view of Yamaguchi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,143,355; hereinafter “Yamaguchi”), and further in view of Rowe, claims 5 and 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephan in view of Yamaguchi, and Rowe, and further in view of Vanderheiden (U.S. Patent No. 6,049,328), claims 11 and 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephan in view of Palalau, and further in view of Rowe, claims 12-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephan in view of Palalau, and Rowe, and further in view of Vanderheiden, claims 17-19 were under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Serial No. 10/664,080 11  
Docket No. C14-16132M/TRK  
(NGB.297)

Stephan in view of Palalau, and Rowe, and further in view of Serravalle, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 4,631,525), and claims 21-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephan in view of Yamaguchi, further in view of Rowe, and further in view of Takahashi (U.S. Patent No. 4,954,967).

Applicant submits that none of the cited references (taken alone or in combination) teach or suggest, “*a guide portion configured to protrude from a surface of the touch sensor and to fringe the surface with a line configured by one of a plurality of concave portions and a plurality of convex portions as a whole, including a fixed reference position, provided for each of the one of the plurality of concave portions and the plurality of convex portions, on a surface of the touch sensor graphically identified on said display surface and located between a vertex and a center of one of said concave portion and said convex portion*” (emphasis added by Applicant), as recited in exemplary claim 1 and similarly recited in exemplary claims 11 and 20.

Furthermore, Applicant has added new claim 25 to claim an additional feature of the invention and to vary the protection for the claimed invention further. This claim is independently patentable because of the novel and nonobvious features recited therein.

That is, none of the cited references (taken alone or in combination) teach or suggest, “*wherein said plurality of concave portions are arranged along a straight line and said plurality of convex portions are arranged along a straight line*”, as recited in exemplary dependent claim 25.

Applicant submits that new claim 25 is patentable over the cited prior art references at least for analogous reasons to those set forth above with respect to claims 1-24.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1-25, all of the claims

Serial No. 10/664,080 12  
Docket No. C14-16132M/TRK  
(NGB.297)

presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, Applicant requests the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Date: March 29, 2009

Respectfully Submitted,



\_\_\_\_\_  
Scott M. Tulino, Esq.  
Registration No. 48,317

Sean M. McGinn, Esq.  
Registration No. 34,386

**MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY  
LAW GROUP, PLLC**  
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200  
Vienna, VA 22182-3817  
(703) 761-4100  
**Customer No. 21254**